UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,550	07/05/2006	Andrew Patrick Wildenberg	007193-17 US	8627
	7590 03/18/200 JUM LAW FIRM, P. C		EXAM	IINER
685 BRIGGS S			GREENE, JAIME M	
PO BOX 929 ERIE, CO 8051	6		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/563,550	WILDENBERG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAIME M. GREENE	1634		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandon application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following periods:	places the a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whicheve no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensions of the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office active set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	WITHIN TWO ension fee ttension fee ion; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of t filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the app Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered becaus (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issuepeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOI 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment car non-allowable claim(s). 	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explan how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be a because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	essary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to perform showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance be See Continuation Sheet.	ecause:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:	
Jaime M. Greene /Carla Myers/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments have been considered but not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Pinkel does not teach using just one nucleic acid sequence and does not teach competative binding. However, while the claims are analyzed in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Since the claims neither require using only one nucleic acid sequence nor that a competative binding occur, the teaching of Pinkel anticipate the claims as broadly written. Further, it should be noted that since the phrase "competative binding" is not defined by the specification, the phrase can broadly encompass, e.g., any hybridization reaction between three sequences regardless of the amount of complementarity between the sequences. Therefore, by teaching contacting an array with two sets of nucleic acids (see, e.g. Pinkel claim 1), Pinkel teaches a competative binding situation.

It is noted that Applicant also presents prior arguments, which begin on page 3 of the arguments and remarks. These arguments have been addressed previously and are maintained for the reasons stated in the Office action of 12/13/2007.